

### **Remarks**

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed on February 8, 2005. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 60-70 are allowed and claims 28, 30-33, 43, and 72-74 include allowable subject matter.

Claims 26, 33, and 71 have been amended and claims 28, 43 and 72 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 26, 30-33, 35, 38-42, 44-47, 60-71, 73-74. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

### **Interview Summary**

Applicant also thanks the Examiner for the telephone interview of March 31, 2005. The Pratt and Von Seidl references were discussed. No agreement was reached. The examiner indicated that amendments to existing claims would be entered where the amendments rewrote allowable claims as independent.

### **Rejections**

Claim 44 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as not being enabled. This rejection is traversed.

Claim 44 is directed at a retaining arrangement that comprises one or more grooves defined in the support platform. The subject matter is addressed in the specification at FIG. 5 and at page 8, lines 19-26 (stating that "In an alternative embodiment, however, the retaining arrangement 128 can include any texture or surface roughness/depressions disposed at the support platform 118 that is capable of constraining the cleaning utensil 100 when it is received within the holder 102. For example, as shown in FIG. 5, the retaining arrangement 128 can include one or more groove members 136 that resistively contact the head 105 when placed within the holder 102, thereby, restricting or limiting the movement of the cleaning utensil 100 when placed within the holder 102"). Applicant submits that claim 44 is enabled.

Claim 26 was rejected as being anticipated by Pratt (US 1,221,587). This rejection is traversed.

As discussed above, claim 26 was amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 28, therefore, claim 26 is allowable.

Claims 35 and 71 were rejected as being obvious over Pratt in view of Von Seidel (US 5,680,929). This rejection is traversed.

Claim 35 depends from and further limits claim 26, which includes the allowable subject matter of claim 28, therefore, claim 35 is also allowable.

Claim 71 was amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 72, therefore, claim 71 is allowable.

Claim 38-42 and 44-47 were rejected as being obvious over Von Seidel in view of Martell (US 5,242,064). This rejection is traversed.

Claim 38 was amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 43, therefore, claim 38 is allowable. Claim 39-42 and 44-47 depend on and further limit claim 38, which the Examiner has indicated includes allowable subject matter, therefore, claims 39-42 and 44-47 are also allowable.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,  
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Date: April 8, 2005

Kate DeVries Smith  
Katherine M. DeVries Smith  
Reg. No. 42,157  
KDS/JEL:sl

